

REMARKS

I. Specification: The Applicants amended claims 1 and 4, by adding the words “made of a single material.” The basis for this amendment is to be found on page 3, lines 20 to 23 of the specification. The basis for new claims 6-8 can be found on page 3, lines 26 to 29 of the specification, and new claims 9 and 10 can be found on page 3, lines 29 to 33 of the specifications.

The Examiner had objected to the abstract of the disclosure, requesting that applicants remove “Figure 1” on line 12, and replace Summary with –Abstract--. The Applicants have amended the abstract of the disclosure to overcome these objections.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102: The examiner had rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,315,206 to Hansen et al. (“the Hansen patent”). Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiners interpretation of the Hansen patent, and the applicant’s claim.

The applicant’s invention concerns a wrapped-card assembly. The wrapped-card assembly comprises a data-encoded card enclosed in a wrapping. The data-encoded card comprises confidential information and non-confidential information in a visible form. The wrapping is made of a single material. The wrapping comprises:

- an opaque area which covers at least partially the confidential information ; and
- a transparent area which covers at least partially the non-confidential information.

The Hansen patent discloses a wallet package. The wallet package includes front and rear panels that close about and secure the wallet card. The front panel is preferably a generally rectangular, planar sheet of paperboard. The front panel defines a card opening that permits viewing of the front surface of the card (See column 4, lines 16 to 49). A transparent window, such as a transparent film, can be secured in the opening to protect the front surface of the card (See column 6, lines 1 to 7).

The Hansen patent thus discloses a wrapping that is made of two different materials rather than a wrapping comprising an opaque area and a transparent area that is made of a single material, for example, advantageously a plastic material. Manufacturing a wrapping according to the applicants is easier and allows therefore a reducing of the costs.

For this reason claim 1 should not be rejected under 35 USC §102, as being anticipated by the Hansen patent, nor under 35 USC § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the Hansen patent.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103 (a): The examiner had rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hansen patent in view of US Patent No. 6,193,163 to Fehrman et al. (“the Fehrman patent”). In addition, the examiner had rejected Claim 3 as being unpatentable over the Hansen patent, as applied to Claim 1. Finally, the examiner had rejected claims 4-5 as being unpatentable over the Hansen patent in view of US Patent No. 6,349,829 to Mattheis et al (“the Mattheis patent”).

None of the cited references disclose a wrapping comprising an opaque area and a transparent area that is made of a single material.

For this reason, claims 1 and 4, and all of their dependant claims, should not be rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. in view of one of the above-mentioned cited references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, the rejections under 35 USC 102 (e) and 35 USC 103 (a) should be withdrawn. Applicants request that this application be allowed to issue as a patent.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard W. Pojunas
Reg. No. 30,314

SchlumbergerSema Inc.
30000 Mill Creek Avenue, Suite 100
Alpharetta, Georgia 30022
Phone: (678) 258-1605
Fax: (678) 258-1686